



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/700,338	11/14/2000	Yoshiyuki Ueno	1110-0279P	3959

7590 11/16/2004  
Birch Stewart Kolasch & Birch  
PO Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

WINKLER, ULRIKE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1648

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

09/700 338 11/14/2000

Y. UENO

Y110-0279P

EXAMINER
----------

U. Winkler

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1648

DATE MAILED: 11/15/04

### EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Mary Anne Armstrong (App Rep) (3) U. Winkler (PTO)  
(2) James House (PTO-SPE) (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of interview 11/15/04

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☐ was not reached.

Claims discussed: all pending

Identification of prior art discussed: Kondo et al.; Harada et al.; Shikukawa et al.;  
Diers et al.; Luo et al.; & Galle et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Discussed possible use of a 3<sup>rd</sup> party expert to explain why the FAS/FAS-C  
mechanism was NOT involved based on the prior art; what the  
differences of pathologies of cirrhosis; hepatic cirrhosis and bile duct dysplasia.  
Discuss the different technologies & models.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

- ☒ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

- ☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.